REMARKS

Claims 1-37 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. The Office Action objected to the disclosures of paragraphs 40 and 42 of the specification. The Office Action rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444 ("Fin") either alone or in view of other references. Claim 37 is amended by this response. Accordingly, claims 1-37 remain pending.

More specifically, the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims	Reference used to reject claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-36	Fin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,216 ("Quatrano")
4 and 14	Fin in view of Quatrano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,564,261
9	Fin in view of Quatrano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,912 ("Anupam")
16	Fin in view of Quatrano and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,253
37	Fin in view of Anupam

The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections of the claims.

Specification

The applicants have amended paragraphs 40 and 42 of the specification in view of MPEP § 608.01. Specifically, the applicants have removed domain information from Uniform Resource Locators ("URLs") appearing in these paragraphs. Because the URLs now appear in the amended specification as "relative" to their domains, these URLs should not be "interpreted as a valid HTML code . . . [or] a live web link." (MPEP § 608.01.) Because these relative URLs should not be interpreted by most software applications to be valid URLs, users should not be able to click on them and thereby be transferred to another web page. As a result, the applicants submit that these paragraphs now comply with MPEP § 608.01.

Claims

The applicants' claims are not obvious in view of the applied references.

Applicants' Technology

The applicants' technology enables multiple client computers to establish a cobrowsing web session with one another. When a user of a first client performs actions in a browser during the cobrowsing web session, e.g., by loading a web page, scrolling the web page, navigating to a link contained in the web page, etc., other cobrowsing clients perform similar actions so that users of the cobrowsing clients can see the actions of the user of the first client. The applicants' technology may send an indication of a cookie ("sharing a cookie") associated with web pages being browsed by the first client to cobrowsing clients. A cobrowsing client can use the cookie to ensure that users of cobrowsing clients see the same web pages and web page content as the user of the first client. The applicants' technology functions with any web page on the Internet, intranets, or elsewhere, and with any content that uses a document object model.

The Fin Reference

The Fin reference is directed to "internet web page sharing." This reference describes simultaneous display and control of web pages among multiple clients. As the Office Action indicates, "Fin fails to teach . . . [using] a cookie of the web site" that is being co-browsed. (Office Action, page 3.) This reference was previously discussed in further detail in the applicants' response to the Office Action of May 19, 2004.

The Quatrano Reference

The Quatrano reference is directed to a "copy server for collaboration." In Quatrano's technique, "a copy server . . . store[s] dynamic content after it is generated by the web site in such a way that the content can be provided repeatedly to two or more participants to a collaboration session without interacting with a web content server." (Quatrano, 1:63-67.) In this technique, an application server (e.g., a server that serves financial information or bookselling information) is modified to interact with the copy server. (Quatrano, 2:66-3:29.) When a user navigates to a web page provided by the application server, the application server provides a copy of the web page to the copy

server and redirects the user's browser to the copy server's copy of the web page by indicating a uniform resource locator ("URL") that is associated with the copy server's copy of the web page. (Quatrano, 3:29-44.)

In Quatrano's technique, participants collaborate by utilizing a collaboration server. (Quatrano, 2:12-13.) When a user desires to collaborate, the user provides the URL associated with the copy server's copy of a web page to the collaboration server, which in turn provides the URL to an "agent browser," which is a browser used by another participant. (Quatrano, 3:56-59.) Because the user's browser and the agent browser both navigate to a URL identifying the copied web page, both browsers can see similar content even if the application server dynamically creates the web page, e.g., based upon a database query.

Quatrano has a pass-through mode in which some content is not copied to the copy server and browsers are not redirected to the content server. (Quatrano, 5:13-14.) The pass-through mode is a conventional technique that can be used to distribute cookies of a server to clients.

Analysis

The applied references neither teach nor suggest utilizing a cookie during cobrowsing. As the Office Action indicates, "Fin fails to teach the limitation . . . [of using] a cookie of the web site." (Office Action, page 3.) However, the Office Action points to Quatrano at 5:12-17 as teaching "the use of cookies . . . for web sites transmitted between collaborative computing devices." (Office Action, page 4.) That section of Quatrano indicates that "cookies and other header information [can be distributed] to all participants' browsers" in a pass-through configuration of the servers that are utilized by Quatrano's technique. (Quatrano, 5:12-14.) Conventional techniques enable unique cookies to be provided to each browsing client. The cookies can be used to store data at a client that relates to a server and is associated with the client. Moreover, in another aspect of Quatrano's technique, cobrowsing clients "receive unique cookies from [the] copy server." (Quatrano, 4:48-50.) The applicants are unable to find any teaching or suggestion in Fin or Quatrano that a first client shares cookies with a second cobrowsing

client. This feature is recited in independent claims 1, 23, and 30. For example, claim 1 recites "sending . . . an indication of a cookie of the web site" and "the cobrowsing [on the second client] uses the indication of the cookie to access the web site."

This feature has also been added to independent claim 37 by this response. The Office Action rejected independent claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Fin in view of Anupam. Anupam neither teaches nor suggests sending an indication of a cookie from a first client to a second cobrowsing client.

Because the independent claims recite sending a cookie from one cobrowsing client to another – a feature not found in the applied references – the applicants submit that these claims are allowable. Because the dependent claims import the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend, the dependent claims are also allowable. Moreover, the claims recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the applied references.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0665, under Order No. 418268782US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-6478.

Dated: March 15, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Rajiv P. Sarathy
Registration No.: 55,592
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant